

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
ELKINS**

**ROBERT MORRIS,**

Petitioner,

v.

**Civil Action No. 2:14-CV-44  
(BAILEY)**

**CITY OF WHEELING, WV,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge John S. Kaull. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Kaull for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Kaull filed his R&R **[Doc. 6]** on June 13, 2014. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny and dismiss without prejudice petitioner's § 2254 petition, which Magistrate Judge Kaull construed as a § 2241 petition **[Doc. 1]**, for failure to exhaust state remedies.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo*


review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Kaull's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on June 16, 2014. See [Doc. 10]. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [**Doc. 6**] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, this Court hereby **DENIES** and **DISMISSES without prejudice** the petitioner's § 2254 petition, which this Court construes as a § 2241 petition [**Doc. 1**], for failure to exhaust state remedies. Therefore, this matter is hereby **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court. The Clerk is directed to enter a separate judgment in favor of respondent.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** July 7, 2014.

  
JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE